DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 473 722 EA 032 317

AUTHOR	Redding, Sam
TITLE	Alliance for Achievement: Building a School Community Focused on Learning.
INSTITUTION	Mid-Atlantic Lab. for Student Success, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	Ser-2
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory at Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education, 1301 Cecil B. Moore Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19122-6091. Tel: 800-892-5550 (Toll Free); Fax: 215-204-5130; e-mail: tcaldwll@temple.edu; Web site: http://www.temple.edu/LSS/.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Community Influence; *Community Schools; Community Support; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Family Environment; *Family Influence; Family Role; Family School Relationship; Parent Empowerment; *Parent Participation; *Parent School Relationship; Parent Teacher Cooperation; Participative Decision Making; *Partnerships in Education; Performance Factors; Role of Education; School Community Programs; *School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	Communitarianism; Community Controlled Education

ABSTRACT

This report describes the Alliance for Achievement project, a guide for constructing a school community that takes into account influences of the home on school performance. The project began in 1989 when 5 Illinois schools developed a plan to focus parental involvement on "the curriculum of the home" and integrate these efforts into a conception of the school as a community that includes teachers, staff, students, and families of students. This report provides a history and the theory base of the project, along with a literature review on community. The report also recaps the Laboratory for Student Success (LSS) project of 1996-98. In that project, Alliance for Achievement was both a service provided to schools and a vehicle for ongoing research on social capital, curriculum of the home, school community, and factors that affect school learning. Data for the LSS project were collected through the School Community survey administered to 7,600 parents and 1,860 teachers in 53 schools. While this report includes several snapshots from the survey, it provides few concrete findings or conclusions. It does, however, include lessons learned and suggestions for further consideration and implementation of the Alliance for Achievement model. (Contains 10 tables and 32 references.) (WFA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

EA EATR
0082

ED 473 722

Alliance for Achievement:
Building a School Community Focused on Learning

by

Sam Redding

Academic Development Institute

2002
Publication Series No. 2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The research reported herein was supported in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U.S. Department of Education through a grant to the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory for Student Success at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position of the supporting agencies, and no official endorsement should be inferred. A major portion of this report was published in the *School Community Journal*. The Laboratory for Student Success reserves all privileges of further publication of all or parts of this document.

EA 032 317

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Alliance for Achievement, Project:
Building a School Community Focused on Learning

Sam Redding

No area of education has received more verbiage, more wasted action, more sincere but misguided programmatic initiative than what we loosely call "parental involvement." For at least two decades, every proposal to improve schools has included a magnanimous overture on the importance of parents. Every school can point to a plethora of events that have attempted, with greater and lesser success, to "get parents involved." Schools that proudly portray their success point to the number of parents captured in the auditorium at the last open house, to the amount of money raised by the parent organization, or to the extent to which the school has included parents on committees. Schools that admit to their failure in engaging parents cite their disappointment in attracting parents to these same categories of involvement, categories that have little to do with the familial factors that contribute to children's learning.

Concern for the role of parents in education arises from a legitimate belief that external influences contribute to children's success in school. The *concern* for parental involvement, however, is too often detached from a reasoned understanding of the parent–child behaviors that research associates with success in school. Efforts at parental involvement too often take on a life of their own, freed from their research base and unconnected to the other functions of the school. Seldom are parent programs part of cohesive, continuous, integrated strategies for enhancing children's learning. Parent programs predictably chug down their own tracks, oblivious to the daily needs of teachers for support from home in such fundamental areas as completion of homework, encouragement to read, and consistent reinforcement of respectful and responsible behavior.

Alliance for Achievement is a blueprint that guides a school-based council in constructing several components of a school community that take into full account influences of the home on school performance. Alliance for Achievement was conceived out of the frustration

of people who had labored at the often fruitless task of involving parents effectively and knew there must be a surer path. The project began in 1989 in five Illinois schools that agreed to develop a road map to sharply focus parental involvement on what is called "the curriculum of the home" and to integrate these efforts into a conception of the school as a community that includes everyone with an intimate attachment to it—teachers, staff, students, and the families of students. Over a 6-year period, the project grew to include 30 schools, selected to provide a diversity of settings and student populations. These schools collaborated in documenting the path that produced results for them, and careful external evaluation confirmed that the schools produced positive changes in family behaviors linked to school learning.

In 1995, the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory, the Laboratory for Student Success (LSS), a federal educational laboratory based at Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CRHDE), adopted the Alliance for Achievement blueprint for inclusion within its Community for Learning (CFL) framework for comprehensive school reform (described at the end of this report). Specifically, LSS included Alliance for Achievement for the purposes of (a) helping schools engage parents in children's learning and strengthen the sense of community among school constituents, and (b) conducting research on the concept of school community. To further both of these purposes, the current author developed and field-tested a survey instrument, the School Community Index, to measure various aspects of parental engagement and the theoretical construct of school community. To strengthen the effectiveness of the Alliance for Achievement blueprint, the author, in collaboration with LSS, created a degree-of-implementation methodology and developed an *Implementer's Handbook* to assist LSS staff in supporting implementation by schools.

Between 1996 and 1998, the School Community Survey (from which the School Community Index is generated) was administered in 53 schools in Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, and Illinois. A grant from the Joyce Foundation supported the use of the survey in Illinois. During this time, the Alliance for Achievement blueprint was implemented with training for

School Community Councils (SCCs) in 24 schools in Pennsylvania and Maryland. This report evaluates that project. After a review of the theory base and of the literature underlying Alliance for Achievement, the report describes the blueprint and discusses implementation of the project with LSS. Results of implementation at involved schools are reported, and conclusions are drawn. The results show positive effects of Alliance for Achievement implementation on school communities. Finally, suggestions for further implementation and study are given, and the role of Alliance for Achievement within a new CFL project is described.

THEORY BASE

Alliance for Achievement is premised on two notions:

- Predominant educational values and expectations among the community of people who constitute a school, especially teachers and parents, affect academic achievement.
- In a school community, the school and the home are part of the *same system,* and family behaviors are not static, external influences on school learning but malleable, internal contributors.

Alliance for Achievement draws upon research on the factors that affect school learning, the sociological literature pertaining to the concept of community as it applies to schools, examinations of social capital, and psychological studies of the impact of family behaviors on children's academic performance. The dominant veins of research that inform the Alliance for Achievement blueprint and provide parameters for its related research can be defined as follows:

- **Factors that affect learning**, which have been identified and their relative power of impact calibrated (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993). Bringing these educational, psychological, and sociological factors to bear in a school is the challenge of education reformers and a topic for study by field-based researchers.

- **Social capital**, an asset found in the connections and support of human relationships (Coleman, 1990). Social capital has diminished in its general availability to children but can be restored in a school community through conscious design.
- **The curriculum of the home**, family practices, behaviors, and relationships that affect children's performance in school (Walberg, 1984). The curriculum of the home can be enhanced through the school's explicit expectations, consistent practices, and training and support of parents.
- **A school community**, the bond formed by shared values and ideals among the constituents of a particular school—school personnel, students, and parents (Sergiovanni, 1994). Community exists to greater and lesser degrees in schools, affects children's academic and personal development, can be measured, and can be built through conscious design.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON COMMUNITY

Community is a term that is much used and little defined. Because of this rhetorical abuse, the concept of community is sometimes given short shrift by educational scholars. But, in addition to its classical roots in Aristotelian political discourse, the idea of community is central to the 150-year intellectual history of sociology and has enjoyed a surge of popular and scholarly attention in the past decade. In connection with schools, the concept of community has been bolstered by a merger with research and thought on the family's role in children's learning (particularly on the notion of the curriculum of the home). Contemporary writing on school community tends to blend the sociologist's advocacy of community as an antidote to the managerial tendencies of mass society with the psychologist's proposition that school learning is affected by factors outside the school, especially family and peer group influences. Thus, a school community is typically portrayed as including families of students and some elements of the

community beyond the school doors. It operates on the basis of shared values, trust, expectations, and obligations rather than through tasks, rules, and hierarchies.

Tracing the intellectual history of community, we find that value-based, intimate associations of one kind or another, larger than kinship groups but sufficiently small to allow for personal contact among members, have been seen as a counterbalance to excessive individualism, the family's limiting strictures on the individual, and the impersonal and inexorable forces of mass society. Problems identified with schooling in America today certainly fall into these same three categories of concern. Children and youth are often described as selfish and uncaring, disadvantaged by family circumstance, and alienated and negatively influenced by mass culture. Perhaps then, school community, even if idealized, contains potential remedies for problems with school-aged children.

Thinkers throughout the modern era have seen community as remedial. Clifford W. Cobb (1992), defining community, has written that

> In a community, people take responsibility for collective activity and are loyal to each other beyond immediate self-interest. They work together on the basis of shared values. They hold each other accountable for commitments. In earlier centuries, a person was born into a community and a set of reciprocal obligations. Now, those who seek an identity as part of a larger whole must invent community by voluntarily committing themselves to institutions or groups. (p. 2)

Cobb's definition of community includes the essential aspects of the modern positive understanding of the term: responsibility, collective activity, loyalty, working together, values held in common, accountability, commitment, identity, voluntarism. If we trace the literature of sociological thought over the past 2 centuries, we find that Cobb's components of community are the proffered remedies for a variety of social ills, put forth by thinkers of various ideological inclinations. Through the eyes of a diverse set of thinkers since the Industrial Revolution, we see the community mediating the numbing intrusion of mass society, checking the barren isolation of

the individual cast against the vast machinery of materialism, engendering sentiments of virtue, and lifting the horizons of the one above the leveling weight of kinship with the many.

Counterbalance to Industrialism

Edmund Burke, the British statesman, wrote at the start of the Industrial Revolution in the 18th century that "To be attached to the subdivision, to love the little platoon we belong to in society, is the first principle (the germ as it were) of public affections. It is the first link in the series by which we proceed towards a love to our country, and to mankind" (1790/1960, p. 44). His statement was an affirmation of community at a time when larger societal forces seemed to be obliterating traditional social attachments. A hundred years after Burke, the Frenchman Émile Durkheim offered a similar complaint and remedy for the condition of *anomie,* the ambient rootlessness he related to suicide and other symptoms of the individual's sense of diminution in the face of industrial, bureaucratic, capitalistic society. Durkheim's remedy was the strengthening of the guild, a medieval invention to be resurrected; attachment to the social unit of the guild would shield the individual from the overwhelming, untempered, and unpredictable winds of society and would offer the context of expectations and obligations necessary to nurture autonomous but morally grounded individuals. Just as Durkheim feared the powerful vagaries of industrial society, he was also suspicious of the limiting influences of the family and clan on the individual (Lasch, 1991, p. 144). Like Burke's little platoons, the guild, or similar midsized social structures (the parish, lodge, neighborhood association, or local political entity), would lift the individual from the restrictive web of close kin and at the same time buffer him from the larger society.

The Voluntary Association

In the 1830s, Alexis de Tocqueville visited a rapidly industrializing America and wrote of his observations. Tocqueville saw in upstart America a chance for a new beginning, a disruption of the path of history, and nothing impressed him more than the abundant voluntary associations.

While Tocqueville promoted human liberty, he feared unfettered individualism; the voluntary association was a perfect mediating device—the individual freely chose attachment to a group, and membership in that group called forth necessary virtues of loyalty, altruism, and responsibility. In his reasoning, "only freedom can deliver the members of a community from that isolation which is the lot of the individual left to his own devices and, compelling them to get in touch with each other, promote an active sense of fellowship" (Tocqueville, 1856/1955, p. xiv).

Tradition-Directed, Inner-Directed, Other-Directed Social Orders

Coming forward to the America of the mid-20th century, we find in David Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd* (1961) a crystallization of accepted wisdom on the spirit of the era and of earlier periods in Western history. Again, community in its various forms is the centerpiece of the analysis. Riesman's book, he explains, is about social character, "that part of 'character' which is shared among significant social groups and which, as most contemporary social scientists define it, is the product of the experience of these groups" (p. 4). Social character is, in large part, the imprint of culture on the individual. Riesman's analysis of social character explains three epochs of Western history, the tradition-directed, inner-directed, and other-directed social orders. He insists that while each era was distinct in its prevailing social organization, the influences of all three are present in contemporary American society.

In a tradition-directed social order, the prevailing mode of social organization in Western history before the Renaissance, the individual conformed to the patterns of life associated with his clan or caste, behavior was prescribed by rigid expectations of etiquette, and the individual was valued because he belonged. "The tradition-directed person," explains Riesman, "hardly thinks of himself as an individual. Still less does it occur to him that he might shape his own destiny in terms of personal, lifelong goals or that the destiny of his children might be separate from that of the family group" (1961, p. 17). The community consisted largely of family and kin, and the web

of values was tight and strong. Shame was the punishment for violating the community's behavioral expectations.

Beginning with the Renaissance and extending into the 20th century, the inner-directed order prevailed. In this period, population growth slowed in advanced cultures, opportunities expanded, rationalism and science replaced superstition and myth, and people became increasingly mobile—likely to move in circles beyond their immediate clan. Tradition remained strong but was splintered and differentiated, the division of labor increased, society became more stratified, and voluntary associations served as communities. Behavior could not be controlled by rules and practices (etiquette), because social situations became increasingly complex, so children were raised to possess inner resources that would guide them beyond the influence of the immediate community. In these inner-directed societies, "the source of direction for the individual is 'inner' in the sense that it is implanted early in life by the elders and directed toward generalized but nonetheless inescapably destined goals" (Riesman, 1961, p. 15). The internal gyroscope of ingrained values guided the individual through life, and the individual was dependent upon parent-like authorities for setting the gyroscope in motion and keeping it spinning. A consequence of straying from the course of this inner pilot was feeling guilt.

Riesman saw the inner-directed social character reaching its zenith in the 19th century, just as the first traces of other-direction began to appear. Tocqueville found other-directedness in the friendly, shallow, unrooted new man in America. The central characteristic of this new man was a demand for approval. Beginning first in the urban upper classes, other-directedness has moved finally into the broad reaches of modern society. Education, leisure, a service economy, smaller families, stable population, and more permissive parenting characterize the other-directed social order. The peer group has become more important to the child, the family less. Contemporaries are the source of direction. Children are increasingly influenced by friends and the mass media. Behavior is not patterned by etiquette or by inner controls but by close attention to (and sensitivity to) the actions and wishes of others. Modern man has an insatiable need for

approval. Riesman has summarized this epoch thus: "The family is no longer a closely knit unit to which [the child] early becomes attentive." As a result, "the other-directed person resembles the tradition-directed person: both live in a group milieu and lack the inner-directed person's capacity to go it alone" (1961, p. 25).

Let us agree with Riesman that the three categories of social character—tradition-directed, inner-directed, and other-directed—exist in varying degrees within each individual and are more prominent among members of certain cultures, subcultures, and communities today. That being the case, it is not surprising that contemporary social critics see evidence of problems stemming from all the categories, including familial and cultural conflict and disadvantage, excessive individualism (selfishness), and valueless, rudderless youth.

Communitarianism

Exploring educational communities in the 1980s, James S. Coleman and his colleagues wrote a series of books and articles based on an extensive study of public and private schools. Coleman demonstrated that Catholic schools were more effective than public schools with children of all socioeconomic backgrounds. The Catholic schools spent less money per student but achieved higher test scores and lower dropout rates. The fact that Catholic schools obtained these impressive results even in inner-city schools where students were typically non-Catholic and from low socioeconomic, Black, and Hispanic backgrounds showed that the Catholic-school success was due neither to the religious nor the socioeconomic background of its students. Instead, it was due to conditions in the schools. Catholic schools nurtured a cohesive sense of community that included adults as well as children. Coleman and Hoffer (1987) concluded that their results underlined "the importance of the embeddedness of young persons in the enclaves of adults most proximate to them, first and most prominently the family and second, a surrounding community of adults" (p. 229).

In related thinking on school communities, Thomas Sergiovanni (1994) returned to the *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft* distinction of the 19th-century German sociologist, Ferdinand Tönnies, and applied it to education. Sergiovanni called for a paradigm shift; schools should be thought of as communities rather than organizations. The culture of a school, its *gemeinschaft*, could foster trust, cooperation, intimacy, and responsibility—all necessary to oppose the societal tendency toward *gesellschaft*, the scientific-managerial model of control through impersonal rules and hierarchies. Sergiovanni's view of community was organic and collective, in contrast to the emphasis on individually selected associations advocated by Cobb, Coleman, and others.

Similarly, in a 1982 study of 54 inner-city, mostly Catholic private schools, James Cibulka, Timothy O'Brien, and Donald Zewe attributed academic and behavioral success of poor children to the "sense of community that existed among faculty, students and parents" (p. 13). They found that successful schools placed great emphasis on parent–teacher communication, sought and valued parents' opinions, and supported parental priorities relative to children's intellectual and moral development.

Other thinkers have proposed a broader communitarianism. Robert Bellah, a professor of sociology at Berkeley, assembled a research team and interviewed Americans of every stripe before publishing the findings in 1985 in *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Amid the case-study vignettes of ordinary Americans, the Bellah team developed a manifesto of communitarianism, deriving its philosophical perspective largely from Tocqueville. It was Tocqueville who used the term *habits of the heart* to describe the mores of family life, religious tradition, and participation in local politics that contributed to a unique American character (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985, p. vii). It was also Tocqueville who wrote with a mixture of awe and anxiety about American individualism, and Bellah wove this Tocquevillian angst through his treatise as a fear of rampant individualism. Bellah's call for community proposed a cure for the ills of Riesman's inner-directed, individualistic, asocial man.

For Amitai Etzioni, the threat of excessive individualism is real, but so is that of the predominant other-directedness he sees in our society. Etzioni has echoed Bellah's clarion call for community from the perspective of a student of formal organizations. He has added intellectual muscle to a growing communitarian movement. Etzioni has advocated "responsive communities," characterized by noncoercive affirmation of values, approximating Riesman's notion of autonomy. A community must be bound by some coherent set of values, but the community must not impose values (as would a tradition-directed culture in Riesman's analysis); rather, a community must form freely around a set of values and include members persuaded of the validity of those values (Etzioni, 1991).

Social Capital

Coleman deserves credit not only for showing the importance of schools as communities but for expanding our understanding of social capital through his research and writing, making it a topic of genuine scholarly inquiry. Looking for the determining ingredients of an economically healthy society, economists isolated physical capital and human capital—tools and training—as the engines of economic vitality. Coleman and others added social capital—the network of norms, obligations, expectations, and trust that forms among people who associate with one another and share common values. Applying the concept to childrearing, Coleman explained: "What I mean by social capital in the raising of children is the norms, the social networks, and the relationships between adults and children that are of value for the child's growing up. Social capital exists within the family, but also outside the family, in the community" (1987, p. 36).

Social capital emerged in the 1990s as a philosophical linchpin in proposed communitarian proposals to solve a range of social, educational, and economic problems. Robert Putnam's 1995 article, "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital," combining a well-stated thesis with an apt and memorable title, became a mostly lauded but also highly debated exposition of the detrimental ripple effects of declining social capital in America. Putnam, a

Harvard professor of international affairs, derived his notions of the efficacy of social capital first from studies of regional differences in government effectiveness in Italy. Putnam found that the effectiveness of government agencies was greater in the north of Italy than in the South, and he posited that a cause of this difference was the unequal distribution of social capital, evidenced in the North's greater propensity for voluntary associations—voter turnout, newspaper readership, and membership in choral societies and football clubs. Because people were more inclined to associate face-to-face through groups that cut across social strata, they developed a greater sense of trust in and obligation to people beyond their primary kinship groups. Thus, their civic engagement was more active and their ability to cooperate more advanced.

Applying this analysis to the United States, Putnam found that from 1960 to the mid-1990s (but especially in the first half of that time), voter turnout declined, church attendance dropped, and membership in voluntary groups such as the PTA, Boy Scouts, Red Cross, service organizations, fraternal societies, and labor unions ebbed sharply. Putnam's most poignant example of this reduction in civic engagement (and in the concomitant possibility for developing social capital) was the fact that while the number of individual bowlers increased 10% between 1980 and 1993, the number of bowlers in leagues declined by 40%. Thus, the trend was toward a more socially disengaged approach to bowling, and "bowling alone" became a synecdoche for a larger social trend. Putnam pointed to a corresponding decline in Americans' level of trust in each other, in government, and in other institutions as a consequence of (and a contributor to) their retreat from social and civic engagement.

While participation in local, face-to-face associations was in decline, Americans were more likely to belong to mass organizations, such as AARP or professional and political-interest groups, that required little personal connection among members. Asking why Americans were withdrawing from secondary-group association and moving toward tertiary groups that were more remote and less demanding of time, Putnam suggested several causes: (a) the movement of women into the labor force; (b) mobility; (c) fewer marriages, more divorces, and fewer children;

(d) the replacement of locally owned and operated businesses by multinational corporations; and (e) the privatization and individualization of entertainment through technological changes (television replacing the movie theater, which replaced vaudeville). His most convincing argument may be his linkage of social withdrawal with new modes of entertainment, which increasingly allow for solitary experience at the expense of social engagement.

In their report, *Becoming Adult in a Changing Society*, Coleman and Torsten Husén (1987) have shown that the burden of building social capital in today's society has fallen on schools. They have described three phases of family–school relationships that correspond with three historical levels of economic development. In Phase I, the family lives at a subsistence level, relying on children for work. Phase I families limit the growth of the child, and the school's role is to free the child from the family and expand the possibilities for wider social development. In Phase II, the industrial economy, the goals of the family and the school converge, with both institutions seeking the ultimate improvement of the child's social and economic well-being. In Phase III, postindustrial affluence, parents view childrearing as an impediment to the pursuits of their adult lives and invest little time and energy in the development of their children. They expect the school to fill the void. This hiring of professionals to provide programmatic and therapeutic surrogates for the nurturing and educative practices of extended families and close communities further explains how social capital can decline, even among the educated and affluent.

Echoing Coleman's discussion of Phase III parental attitudes, Etzioni (1993) has explained how the formation of social capital within families, traditionally the greatest engine for its formation, is in jeopardy because of the reduced amount of time many children spend with parents. Etzioni remarks,

> The fact is that parenting cannot be carried out over the phone, however well meaning and loving the calls may be. It requires physical presence. The notion of "quality time" (not to mention "quality phone calls") is a lame excuse for parental absence; it

> presupposes that bonding and education can take place in brief time bursts, on the run. *Quality time occurs within quantity time.* As you spend time with [your] children—fishing, gardening, camping, or "just" eating a meal—there are unpredictable moments when an opening occurs and education takes hold. (p. 57)

Dana Mack (1997) has also provided a cogent analysis of changes in family life that parallel the centrifugal trends in society, diminishing the social capital even within the basic primary group. Mack's critique differs from that of Putnam and others in finding fault with a cloying insistence on artificial and externally imposed allegiance to the group. Mack's perspective resembles Riesman's, showing alarm at the educationist's disregard for inner-directedness. This approach stressing individual choice varies from the Coleman and Putnam emphasis on social capital, but it does not contradict it. Coleman has seen the benefits of social capital as an asset to the individual within the context of rational choice theory, while Putnam has underlined the voluntary selection of associations rather than the contrived imposition of social bonds as the threshold to the accumulation of social capital.

Mack has challenged education's mimicry of corporate models, as has Sergiovanni, but Mack has been more concerned with the imposition of other-directedness than with the remoteness of an organizational mentality. Mack writes,

> It is no accident that the way schools manage kids is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish from the way corporations manage employees. . . . But there is a far more widespread and spurious connection between educational and industrial psychology today—the tendency of both to rest on the assumption that human productivity is greatest where the needs and interests of individuals are submerged to the needs and interests of groups, and where the individual is manipulated to adapt to the demands of group solidarity. . . . In schools, the increasing preoccupation with group psychodynamics and their ostensible relationship to personal motivation and productivity is troubling. (1997, p. 143)

In sum, social capital theory suggests that for children, social capital is a mediating variable, a consequence of institutional (family, neighborhood, community, church) structures and arrangements, and an asset banked and withdrawn in varying amounts. In the end, the wealth of social capital available to the child and the ability to take advantage of this potential benefit contribute to that child's success in school and in life.

Families and Schools: The Curriculum of the Home

Social capital theory shows the importance of both families and schools in fostering community, and many educators believe the family–school link is crucial to building communities. Herbert J. Walberg (1984) has summarized the research on the family's impact on learning. He justified changes in educational practices by asserting education's connection to national economic development, and he did more than ask parents for their cooperation; he contended that schools should take the initiative in establishing partnerships with the home. Walberg states, "Research shows that both home conditions that are conducive to learning and the relationship of the home to the school have deteriorated in recent decades, but school/home partnership programs can bring about dramatic improvements" (p. 400). Walberg claims not only that the home environment strongly affects a child's learning but also (in this regard more positive than Mack about schools' influence) that schools could influence the home environment by establishing partnerships with families.

A quarter century of research has convinced most educators that influences of the home weigh heavily on a child's achievement in school. Dissection of family life has produced long lists of characteristics of an optimal home environment. Schools and other organizations are teaching parents to put into practice the components of family life that have been called, we have seen, "the curriculum of the home." This curriculum does not consist of subject matter but of patterns of habit formation and attitude development that prepare a child for academic learning and sustain the child through the years of schooling. The curriculum of the home

predicts academic learning twice as well as the socioeconomic status of families. This curriculum includes informed parent/child conversations about everyday events, encouragement and discussion of leisure reading, monitoring and joint analysis of televiewing, deferral of immediate gratifications to accomplish long-term goals, expressions of affection, and interest in children's academic and personal growth. (Walberg, 1984, p. 400)

Joyce L. Epstein (1987) has reinforced the idea that schools should take the initiative in procuring parent participation in the child's schooling. Epstein masterfully summarizes the research connecting parent involvement to effective education. She then sets down actions that administrators, particularly principals, could take to enhance parent participation: "Administrators can help teachers successfully involve parents by coordinating, managing, supporting, funding, and recognizing parent involvement" (p. 133).

Programs to involve parents in these ways proliferated during the 1980s, seeking to improve student learning by bolstering the curriculum of the home and engaging parents in the educational development of their children. James Comer, Dorothy Rich, and Epstein were among the educational leaders who provided practical transitions from research to implementation. A meta-analysis by Margaret C. Wang, Geneva D. Haertel, and Walberg (1993) found home and community influences among the strongest contributors to academic attainment. Especially powerful were the influences of the family—the daily patterns of family life that encouraged learning and schoolwork. Various studies have amplified this message by asserting its validity in particular settings and for specific school populations. Kim O. Yap and Donald Y. Enoki (1995), for example, studied the effects of parental involvement efforts on the academic achievement of Chapter 1 students in Hawaii and concluded that parent programs that focused on involvement in the instructional process increased home-based parental activities to reinforce student learning and raised literacy skills of parents most directly influenced learning outcomes.

The particular family behaviors that contribute to school learning can be neatly summarized; they surround the activities of reading (including parent–child discussion of reading), parent–child discussions of school and learning, homework and other study at home, and expectations, structures and routines regarding work, punctuality, and daily living (Dave, 1963). For some families, these behaviors come naturally; for others, they may be learned and adopted. The school, properly perceived as a community, can take the lead in making clear the kinds of home environment that best support school learning and in providing support for parents who wish to align their family life with these behavioral correlates with school success.

Despite a plethora of evidence that the home environment directly and powerfully affects school performance, and despite substantial, research-based programmatic efforts to improve homes in ways that will benefit children's learning, results of such efforts have often been disappointing. Recent studies and hypotheses have pointed to mutations in traditional family structures as a reason for the intractability of home environments. David Blankenhorn (1995), for example, has targeted the absence of fathers from family life—through higher divorce rates, dramatically increased numbers of out-of-wedlock births, and neglect—as a change in family makeup that has produced a number of social ills, including greater challenges to schools.

Mack (1997) has drawn upon the societal critique to explain pressures on families that make their attention to advantageous patterns of behavior difficult. In her view, "parents see the decline of social supports and the breakdown of families as symptoms of a larger phenomenon: the sudden and rapid decay of those stable social values that once fostered a protective culture of childhood" (p. 17). This unhinging is reminiscent of Riesman's description of the shift away from a tradition-directed context for childrearing.

Thomas Lickona (1991) has seen the same hamstringing of the family by larger forces at work in society and singled out the school as the institution most likely to rectify the resulting loss to children. He states,

> Escalating moral problems in society—ranging from greed and dishonesty to violent crime to self-destructive behaviors such as drug abuse and suicide—are bringing about a new consensus. Now, from all across the country, from private citizens and public organizations, from liberals and conservatives alike, comes a summons to the schools: Take up the role of moral teachers of our children. (pp. 4–5)

The school, then, is charged not only with the task of improving the home environment by influencing and educating parents through such projects as the curriculum of the home but also with supplanting (or at least heavily supplementing) the home as a purveyor of morality and civil behavior—as a builder of viable communities.

Building Community in Schools

We return to Cobb to make the case for community in schools: "An effective school has to be a community in which personal relationships based on trust outweigh impersonal rules. A community based on shared vision and close personal interactions is not a frill; it is a necessity" (1992, p. 23). Cobb's placement of community in opposition to "impersonal rules" is, like Mack's, a critique of the managerial and bureaucratic operation of public schools.

Sergiovanni (1994, 1995) echoes Cobb's assertion that school must be a place of community (without, however, endorsing Cobb's insistence that effective associations must be voluntary—an argument that supports school vouchers). He also amplifies Putnam's condemnation of the corrosive effects of social norms that emphasize individualism at the expense of more altruistic commitments. Sergiovanni's school community is bound by shared values, requiring that its constituents engage in processes to articulate, define, and refine their educational values.

A special contribution of a school community, in Coleman's view (1990), is its possibility of achieving what he calls "intergenerational closure," a closer contact of children with adults from outside the family group. When the adults who care about a group of children are

themselves not in association with one another, as is typical in modern society, the children's influence on one another is heightened, and intergenerational transmission of the culture is stymied. For example, it is common for children to sit next to each other in a classroom each day for many hours, week after week, month after month, yet for their parents to have no association with each other or with children from other families apart from the school or in connection with the school. In fact, these adults may not know one another, even though their children are growing up together and strongly shaping each other's lives. A school community would draw parents into greater contact with each other and with others' children, achieving Coleman's intergenerational closure. The benefits would be twofold: Children would be known by, cared for, and watched out for by a larger number of adults, and parents of a group of children would maintain communication among themselves, sharing standards, norms, and experiences of childrearing.

Paul J. Baker (1991) sees a school community as a microcosm of the community at large, incorporating four familiar institutions: the firm, a disciplined production system with highly skilled workers; the family, a caring and supportive group of adults who care about the children and children who respect the adults; the fair, members of the school community coming together to celebrate their best work; and the forum, a public meeting place encouraging informed dialogue and intellectual inquiry. Along with this reflection of familiar institutions is a broadening of the context of learning beyond the schoolhouse doors. Reading, for example, should not be limited to individual pursuits of students performing daily assignments according to routine classroom schedules. As Baker and R. Kay Moss (1993) contend, "Reading needs a broader social context offering endless opportunities for shared learning among students, parents, and teachers" (p. 24).

Academic and Social Competence

Building children's accomplishments is important in building community in schools. Research has identified key competencies of resilient children, including social and intellectual competencies, realistic goal setting, planning, and resourcefulness. These traits are not innate, nor are they acquired only inferentially. They are abilities that can be taught and learned within the contexts of family, school, and community (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1997). The Alliance for Achievement process for building school communities (Redding, 1990) was developed first in inner-city Chicago schools to provide a larger context for children to acquire academic and social skills. This larger context was described as a school community, where the people intimately attached to a school—teachers, staff, students, and families of students—share goals for the academic and social learning of children, communicating and associating with one another to further their shared educational goals (Redding, 1996). The inclusion in Alliance for Achievement of social learning (or character development) alongside a focus on the building blocks of academic learning, such as reading and study habits, relied upon research demonstrating especially the influence of the home on school learning (Dave, 1963; Kellaghan, Sloane, Alvarez, & Bloom, 1993; Walberg, 1984) and the necessity of including social learning as a goal in strengthening the school–home nexus (Weissberg, 1991, 1997).

Research has indicated that to enhance academic and social learning within a community context, the school first identifies specific, alterable behaviors of parents, teachers, and students that affect learning and then seeks to use the attributes of community—face-to-face association, trust, obligations, and expectations—to encourage members of the community to behave in the desired manner. Etzioni (1991) and Sergiovanni (1994) have written extensively on the community's reliance upon communication, education, and persuasion to mold behavior instead of the less effective (and often counterproductive) modes of behavioral control typically employed by a bureaucratic organization. People who share an interest in a common group of children and take the time to associate with one another to share standards, norms, and experiences of raising and educating children can become a community. A community of this

type can provide an environment conducive to the learning and social development of all children. And through working to sustain shared values and reach common goals, such schools can achieve some of the chief characteristics of community identified by sociological wisdom of the past two centuries.

THE ALLIANCE FOR ACHIEVEMENT BLUEPRINT

In the version of the Alliance for Achievement blueprint for school community used for the LSS project, when a school chose to implement the blueprint, the LSS staff would assist the school in administering the School Community Survey, prepare a School Community Index report based on the surveys, and conduct an Implementation Workshop for the newly formed School Community Council, consisting of the principal, two teachers, and four parents. The council would receive a set of videotapes, and each SCC member receive a *Planning Guide* including meeting agendas and activities for 19 semimonthly SCC meetings. The process outlined in the *Planning Guide* also includes the following topics for inquiry and action:

- **Representative governance**: How does the school include parents, teachers, and administrators in decision making? (The SCC is the centerpiece of representation.)
- **Educational values**: What organizing principles, core beliefs, or distinguishing characteristics define the school and give synergy to its constituencies? (The SCC develops a set of educational values, goals, and expectations for parents, teachers, and students.)
- **School–home communication**: How does the school provide ongoing mechanisms for two-way communication between teachers and parents? (The SCC appoints a subcommittee for school–home communication; all subcommittees include an SCC member chair and non-SCC teachers and parents.)

- **Parent and teacher education**: How does the school become a true learning community by attending to the education of teachers, staff, and parents as well as students? (The SCC appoints a subcommittee for parent and teacher education.)
- **Common experience**: What experiences do all students in the school share that give meaning to membership in a community? (The SCC plans activities and recommends policies that enhance common experience.)
- **Intergenerational association**: How does the school reach into available populations of adults—particularly senior citizens, college students, and community volunteers—to increase the amount of time and attention children receive from caring adults? (The SCC plans value-based intergenerational associations.)
- **Intragenerational association**: How does the school cut across age and program lines to bring students together for educational purposes? (The SCC plans value-based intragenerational associations.)
- **Measures of progress**: How does the school measure its progress toward school community and know that its efforts are yielding advantages for students? (The SCC appoints a Quality Team to manage data and report findings; the team includes an SCC member chair and non-SCC teachers and parents.)
- **Homework**: What does the school expect of parents, teachers, and students regarding homework? How is homework used to extend learning time and build study habits? (The SCC recommends a school homework policy and monitors its effects.)
- **The parent–teacher–student alliance**: How are parent–teacher–student conferences made most productive? (The SCC develops agendas and a "next-step" system for parent–teacher–student conferences.)
- **Links to community agencies**: How does the school take the initiative in allying with youth organizations—Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4-H, Boys and Girls Clubs,

YMCA, YWCA, and dozens of others—to expand opportunities for all young people? (The SCC seeks connections with youth organizations.)

The LSS staff would provide consulting support for the School Community Council. The school could achieve the statuses of *Certified School Community* and *Effective School Community* by meeting implementation criteria provided in the *Planning Guide*. These criteria correspond with successful implementation of the action topics listed above.

IMPLEMENTATION IN THE LABORATORY FOR STUDENT SUCCESS

As indicated above, the Alliance for Achievement framework was selected for inclusion in the program offerings of the then new Laboratory for Student Success, the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory, in late 1995, and the Principal Investigator for the project was charged with field-testing the model, revising and improving it, and conducting research on school communities and the curriculum of the home. The following describes the activities of LSS staff and schools during implementation.

In 1996, the PI provided the LSS extension office for the eight involved schools from the Penn Hills school district in Pennsylvania with three instruments to establish baseline data for the project evaluation. The instruments were a needs assessment to be completed by the principal, a School Community Survey to be administered to all teachers in the schools, and a School Community Survey to be administered to all parents in the schools. These instruments were administered in the schools in May 1996. The Academic Development Institute, a sponsor of Alliance for Achievement, also provided the Penn Hills extension office with two tools for monitoring the progress of the councils: a list of objectives and target completion dates for the council and a documentation chart to enable LSS implementers (consultants supporting CFL in schools) to report periodically on the progress of each council and on the documentation received. Meanwhile, data from 1,100 surveys from parents and teachers in seven of the eight Penn Hills schools were compiled, and a School Community Index report was prepared for each school.

Also prepared was a report for the six elementary schools combined and one for all seven schools combined.

In 1997, evaluative site visits of project schools in Penn Hills and Hampton Township school districts in Pennsylvania were conducted, and the PI wrote an *Implementer's Handbook* for LSS and district staff who consult with project implementers or supervise implementation. Data on the progress of implementation at project schools were collected and documented. In 1998, five schools in the Blairsville-Saltsburg district in Pennsylvania joined the project and administered the School Community Survey. Three schools in the Hampton Township district that had previously administered the surveys for information agreed to join the project. The survey was also administered in the seven Penn Hills schools that completed their 2nd year in the project.

To support the project, LSS established extension offices for project schools, since Alliance for Achievement requires significant consulting support for schools as they implement their SCCs and progress through the *Planning Guide*. The extension offices were designed to provide on-site consultation for the individual schools and networking among schools in their geographic area. Under this system, clusters of schools implemented the Alliance for Achievement blueprint, chiefly in western Pennsylvania. In that area, where support was provided through the extension office at Penn Hills, the cluster of schools grew to include four districts: Penn Hills, Hampton Township, Blairsville-Saltsburg, and Bedford (see Tables 1 and 2 for data on specific schools included).

At the time of the project, the amount of consulting support to schools in western Pennsylvania did not expand to accommodate the increased number of schools in the project, nor did facilitators (teachers acting as CFL representatives) and LSS implementers providing support for other components of the CFL model receive training or encouragement to include Alliance for Achievement within their purview. The implementer at the Penn Hills extension office assigned to provide support for Alliance for Achievement was able to bring new schools into the project,

assist them in administering the School Community Survey, and organize the implementation workshops. However, because the implementer has other responsibilities for LSS and for the Penn Hills School District, time permitted only a limited amount of on-site support for SCCs or for networking and advanced training. Thus, the relative progress of the schools' implementation seemed largely a function of the commitment and persistence of the building principals. As indicated below, the Alliance for Achievement blueprint has since been better integrated with CFL efforts.

FIELD-BASED RESEARCH

In the LSS project, Alliance for Achievement was both a service provided to schools and a vehicle for ongoing research on social capital, curriculum of the home, school community, and factors that affect school learning. The data collected served both to evaluate and refine the implementation of the project and to shed light on school communities. As the number of schools participating in the project grew, and as additional schools not in the project used the project's primary data source—the School Community Survey—for other purposes, the amount of data accumulated, establishing the groundwork for a broad base of information on a host of variables relative to school communities and families.

The data presented in this report show what was learned from the 1996–1998 work in schools with LSS. The information also makes an evaluative statement about the implementation of Alliance for Achievement, offering grounds for the later modifications of the project within the CFL model. But the data primarily serve to demonstrate attempts to quantify the components of school communities so that we may better understand and know how to build them.

Methods

Subjects

Although individual parents and teachers completed School Community Surveys that provided the data for this study, the data were compiled to present school-level numbers. For

example, Likert scales (5-point, Agree-Disagree) were reported as percentages of parents (or teachers) agreeing with a particular statement. So one number (the percentage) was derived for each school for a single Likert-scale variable. The subjects, then, were schools rather than individuals. A list of these schools, clustered by district, is provided in Table 1 on the status of project schools, along with data regarding degree of implementation and various scale scores on the School Community Index (see the end of the report for all tables). The list of the schools (omitting two schools that did not conduct surveys) in Table 2 provides additional data used in the studies outlined in this report, including average daily attendance, poverty (percentage of students receiving subsidized lunches), and scaled scores for the highest available grade level of the Pennsylvania State Assessments. Attendance, poverty, enrollment, and faculty figures for Penn Hills, Hampton Township, New Jersey, and Maryland schools are from the 1995–96 school year, the year just completed as they joined the project. The same figures for Bedford and Blairsville-Saltsburg schools are from 1997–98, the year just completed as they joined the project. Figures are included for all schools involved in the project, though New Jersey, Maryland, and some Pennsylvania schools did not complete implementation through the second School Community Index assessment by the end of 1998.

Instrument

The School Community Index, again, is a statistical report generated from surveys administered to the principal, teachers, and parents in a school. These School Community Surveys consist of

- a **teachers' version** with 65 Likert-scale statements about aspects of school community, divided into nine topical scales, with which the respondent expresses agreement or disagreement, and
- a **parents' version** with the same set of 65 Likert-scale statements, a set of questions on the parents' involvement in school activities, and a set of questions related to the

curriculum of the home, questions about home behaviors that affect children's school performance.

The surveys were administered to all the classroom teachers in the schools and, typically, sent home with students for their parents to complete and return. A good return (the target for each school) was 90% of the teachers and 40% of the parents of students in the school. Once collected, the survey results were entered into a database, and a School Community Index report was generated, with charts, graphs, and statistical presentations of the data. The SCC, following a threshold-analysis process provided in the back of the report, reviewed the report. The SCC drew conclusions from the report and established an action plan based on it. At the same time, the data gathered was examined by the PI and used to inform various studies designed to gain a better understanding of the nature of school communities. The School Community Index was organized to report on the following components of school community:

- **Parental Involvement in School Activities**
    - attendance at parent organization meetings
    - attendance at open houses
    - participation in parent-teacher conferences
    - contact with teachers
    - contact with other parents
    - assistance in the classroom
    - participation on school committees
- **Curriculum of the Home**
    - time children spend studying at home
    - time children spend reading at home
    - children's study habits
    - children's reading habits
    - parent–child interaction about school and reading

- parent–child visits to libraries, museums, etc.
- children's televiewing habits

- **Parents' and Teachers' Perceptions of the School Regarding**
  - the roles of parents and teachers
  - the role of students
  - academic development
  - character development
  - reading
  - homework and studying
  - school–home communication
  - association of school community members
  - common experience/school climate

Over a 2-year period (1996 to 1998), the School Community Survey was administered to 7,600 parents and 1,860 teachers in 53 schools in Illinois, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New Jersey. At the same time, LSS researchers monitored the activities of School Community Councils in 24 schools.

Research Questions

Using the School Community Index and other sources of data, the PI sought findings and conclusions to address the following questions:

- **Research Question 1**: What are the relationships among socioeconomic factors, institutional characteristics, and school community as measured by the School Community Index?
- **Research Question 2**: What are the relationships between school-community and student-learning outcomes?

- **Research Question 3**: What are the relationships between the degree of implementation of Alliance for Achievement and changes in the School Community Index?
- **Research Question 4**: What are the relationships between the degree of implementation of Alliance for Achievement and changes in student-learning outcomes?
- **Research Question 5**: What are the relationships between changes in the School Community Index and changes in student-learning outcomes?

Findings

It is important to preface this report of findings with the following caveat: The number of subjects (schools) included in this data set is small, even though the number of survey respondents is large. Drawing conclusions from correlative studies with a small number of comparative units is dangerous. The correlations and other statistics reported below do, however, demonstrate the framework of research that accompanied this project. As the number of schools implementing Alliance for Achievement in future projects grows, the power of the observations will also grow, and the framework of research will yield a more convincing understanding of school communities.

The findings, then, are preliminary and are reported as first attempts at addressing the five research questions. The first two questions seek a better understanding of the components of school communities, while the last three questions bear upon the effects of implementation of the Alliance for Achievement model.

Components of School Community

To examine the first two research questions above, a correlational study of nine exclusively K–5 schools (chosen to control for differences in school constitution) was conducted with the following variables:

- the school's poverty index (percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch),
- average daily attendance,
- reading and math scores (percentage of fifth graders scoring at or above grade-level norm on state assessment), and
- various items and scales on the School Community Index.

Tables 3–6 include survey items that yielded the strongest correlation with poverty, attendance, reading, or mathematics.

As a general conclusion regarding the first two questions on socioeconomic factors, institutional characteristics, and components of school community, survey items designed to measure aspects of school community correlated positively with average daily attendance, reading, and math and negatively with the level of poverty in the student population. For example, teachers' perception that they talk with parents on the telephone and that study skills are taught correlated positively with both reading and math achievement, as shown in Table 6.

Implementation

The final three research questions consider the relationships among degree of project implementation, changes in components of the School Community Index, and changes in academic performance as measured by school-level scores on state assessments in reading and math.

The third research question on the relationship between the degree of Alliance implementation and changes in the School Community index has been approached from two angles:

- Does the School Community Index measure real differences between schools?
- Do schools that implement the Alliance for Achievement blueprint yield positive changes in the School Community Index?

Differences Between Schools. In an analysis of survey results from seven schools in the same district (Penn Hills), where one might expect great similarity in results and little difference, the Likert-scale portion of the School Community Index produced statistically significant (at the .05 level) between-school differences on all nine teacher scales and on eight of the nine parent scales. The cumulative means of the nine scales for both parents and teachers yielded significant between-school differences. The conclusion is that the School Community Index portrays real differences between schools on various aspects of the theoretical construct of school community.

Degree of Implementation and Effects on School Community Index. The number of SCC meetings held in a 2-year period by the seven schools in the same district that implemented the Alliance for Achievement blueprint was used as a convenient control for degree of implementation. This number was correlated with the amount of gain on the School Community Index over the same 2-year period. The School Community Survey was administered at the beginning of the 2-year period, just before implementation of Alliance for Achievement, and again 2 years later.

Degree-of-implementation data were available for six of the seven schools used for this analysis. The correlation between degree of implementation and gain on the School Community Index (derived from the totals of several scales, including parents' and teachers') was determined for these six schools. Both measures of implementation, the number of meetings and the percentage score for Degree of Implementation as established by the project implementer are displayed in Tables 7–9, which address research questions 3–5. Results relevant to those questions are discussed in the following section.

Conclusions

Although levels of parental involvement and the curriculum of the home vary from school to school, preimplementation surveys conducted in the nine K–5 schools reveal a picture of a "typical" school community that is instructive in arriving at an understanding of the norm.

In the K–5 schools surveyed,

- 86% of parents reported attending an annual open house in the past year.
- 76% of parents reported attending a parent–teacher conference in the past year.
- 33% of parents reported attending two or more PTO/PTA meetings in the past year.
- 50 to 65% of students studied at home 4 or more days per week, according to their parents.
- about half of students, according to their parents, spent the equivalent of 10 minutes per grade level per day, 4 or more days per week, studying at home.
- about a third of children studied on their own initiative, according to their parents.
- about a third of students, according to their parents, spent 30 minutes or more per day, 5 or more days per week, reading at home.
- two thirds of parents reported having talked with their child about the child's schoolwork on 5 or more days in the past week.
- half of parents reported having talked with their child about the child's reading on 3 or more days in the past week.
- about 40% of children watched TV less than 1½ hours per day.
- half of parents reported having visited a library with their child in past month.
- 60% of parents visited a museum, aquarium, arboretum, zoo, planetarium, or botanical garden with their child in the past 6 months.

A rough conclusion from these snapshots of reported family life is that, in a typical elementary school, about half of parents are doing the things we know may contribute to their children's learning, and about half of students are doing at home the things we know may contribute to their school learning. If this is the case, can we improve children's learning in a school community by increasing the proportion of families that exhibit the specific behaviors we associate with the curriculum of the home? Can we best enhance that curriculum by building a

school community that places a high value, and explicit expectations, on the family's role in children's education? The most marked, positive changes in curriculum-of-the-home factors for all seven project schools (including those with a minimal degree of implementation) in postimplementation surveys are illustrated in Table 10.

If we can anticipate trends in relationship from these early data, we see, in relation to research questions 3 and 4, a positive correlation between degree of implementation, improvement in teachers' perceptions of the school community, and academic performance. Slight, and somewhat negative, was the relationship between degree of implementation and parental factors. We might suspect that this is because most of the schools in this sample were at early stages of implementation, when teachers would be more aware of the implementation than parents. Another explanation is also likely. All seven schools achieved gains on the curriculum-of-the-home factors over the 2-year period, even though the magnitude of change was negatively correlated with degree of implementation measured later in the period. Therefore, it seems possible that all schools in the project positively affected family behaviors early in the project, having lasting effects separate from the school's continued degree of project implementation.

Having noted, in relation to research question 5, the generally positive correlation between various scaled items on the School Community Survey (components of school community) and measures of academic performance of the schools' students (state assessments in reading and math), we might expect that by improving scores on measures of school community through an implementation strategy targeted at those factors, we would also improve learning. This assumption, of course, depends upon a cause-effect relationship between components of school community and learning. Alliance for Achievement is premised upon this assumption; its programmatic interventions seek to improve the school community and enhance the curriculum of the home, resulting in positive changes on the School Community Index (as evidence of a stronger school community) and improved learning. After two years of intervention, however, only one school in the project had achieved a degree of implementation (82%) high enough to

pass a threshold of anticipated institutional change sufficient to affect learning. (It seems logical that a school must implement to a threshold level to produce results in tested learning.) Across the board, degree of implementation correlated positively with improvement in reading and math assessments, as shown in Table 8.

Conclusions must be drawn cautiously at this point, with only a few schools reaching a point of implementation sufficient to include degree-of-implementation factors in the analysis. A framework for ongoing study has been established, however, and a better picture of school communities should emerge in future Alliance for Achievement implementation within the CFL model.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER IMPLEMENTATION AND STUDY

Lessons Learned

Implementation and study of Alliance for Achievement within the context of the Laboratory for Student Success has revealed several lessons and important points for future consideration which should be taken into account to aid in revising the implementation strategies, developing new materials and training programs, and scaling up to reach more schools and more strongly affect learning in the schools where the project has taken root. Among these lessons are the following:

1. Alliance for Achievement is *most expeditiously implemented* where
    - it is strongly endorsed by the superintendent,
    - existing governance structures are straightforward and do not preclude the role of an SCC,
    - it fits into an overall school-improvement and school-governance strategy,
    - supporting agencies like LSS have an established, positive relationship with the school, and

- the principal understands the model and appreciates its potential.

2. Alliance for Achievement finds *less fertile ground for implementation* where
   - there is no strong endorsement from the superintendent or other significant line administrator external to the school,
   - existing governance structures are complex and allow little room for an SCC,
   - existing governance structures have arisen to balance the interests of competing constituencies,
   - the relationship between supporting agencies and the school is insufficient to create an initial assumption of credibility on the part of school personnel, and
   - the principal does not understand or does not appreciate the potential of the model.
3. Adopting the Alliance for Achievement model commits a school to two meetings of an SCC each month for at least two years. The work of the SCC, as outlined in the Alliance for Achievement *Planning Guide*, includes significant changes in the operation of the school over an extended period of time. For these reasons, *schools should be aware of the commitment the model requires.*
4. Some school administrators quickly see the merits of Alliance for Achievement and indicate their interest in adoption. When this happens, the *supporting agencies must respond immediately and competently* to help the school weave the model into its school improvement plan and prepare the various school constituencies for possible adoption.
5. Supporting agencies must prepare to scale up, not only to add a critical mass of involved schools but also to develop the capacities of the Alliance for Achievement blueprint to help schools sustain their efforts. In this project, the inadequate level of LSS field staff support was a major obstacle to sustaining current schools and

certainly hampered expansion. Schools in the Penn Hills district receive a reasonable amount of support from LSS staff in the district's extension office, but schools outside the district received minimal support, and this lack hindered their efforts to sustain implementation.

6. When schools begin the Alliance for Achievement process, they receive a timeline for submission of documentation to the implementation coordinator at the extension office. It is important to keep the schools on track, to collect the documentation, and to include an accounting of the documentation and the progress of the schools in the extension offices' reports.
7. In order to serve a clearinghouse function, a mechanism for capturing the stories, activities, and accomplishments of the participating schools must be established. Each SCC should name a network communicator. This person would be an SCC member who assumes the responsibility of informing the implementer of the activities of the SCC. The implementer may then respond with on-site visits, requests for media coverage, arrangements for photographs, and compilation of activity reports for inclusion in network newsletters.
8. As groups of Alliance for Achievement schools cluster around an extension office, methods for sharing ideas should be established. At a minimum, SCC members from all Alliance schools in a geographic region should have the opportunity to meet for an annual conference.
9. Supportive activities, such as certifications and conferences for active sites, should be expanded, and supportive materials, such as the *Planning Guide*, should be revised when needed to meet changing conditions.
10. Where several school-reform components, including Alliance for Achievement, exist within a school, the reform implementers and in-school facilitators serving the school should be trained to support Alliance for Achievement and offer integrated guidance.

EVOLUTION OF THE ALLIANCE FOR ACHIEVEMENT ROLE

After the 1996–1998 LSS project, Alliance for Achievement began to evolve in new directions, in part because of the findings reported here. In the spring of 2000, Alliance for Achievement became part of the Mega Demonstration Project, a collaborative effort to establish and demonstrate structures and practices to maintain continuous school improvement. This project, like the earlier one, uses the framework of the Community for Learning. CFL is a research-based and field-tested comprehensive school reform program developed at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education. The CFL model has proven successful in schools across the mid-Atlantic region, providing comprehensive improvements in school structures and instructional practices. The Mega Demonstration Project, now in progress, uses the CFL model, combined with other elements like Alliance for Achievement, to bring to scale the successful school-improvement programs that LSS has incubated. In this project, the Alliance Planning Guide has been revised, and SCCs have been adapted into support teams working integrally with other CFL teams. In this collaborative effort, Alliance for Achievement gives the project a structured, research-based component for systematically engaging parents and forming the constituents of a school into a community for learning.

Table 1

Status of the Project Schools

SCHOOL TYPE	SCHOOL	CITY	STATE	IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHOP	Parental Involvement Index 1	Parental Involvement Index 2	Curriculum of the Home Index 1	Curriculum of the Home Index 2	Teacher Perceptions Index 1	Teacher Perceptions Index 2	Parent Perceptions Index 1	Parent Perceptions Index 2	SCHOOL COMMUNITY	SCHOOL COMMUNITY	DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION (DECEMBER)
K –5	Bedford Elementary School	Bedford	PA	11/2/98	41		56		71		68		56		
6–8	Bedford Middle School	Bedford	PA	11/2/98	36		45		82		62		51		
K–5	Hyndman/Londonderry Elem.	Hyndman	PA	11/2/98	48		52		77		69		58		
9–12	Bedford Senior High School	Bedford	PA	11/2/98	25		46		56		49		41		
6–12	Hyndman Junior/Senior High	Hyndman	PA	11/2/98	39		43		62		56		47		
K–5	Dible Elementary School	Pittsburgh	PA	3/27/96	54	53	51	59	65	64	65	68	57	59	24%
K–5	Forbes Elementary School	Verona	PA	3/27/96	55	56	51	56	75	80	70	72	60	63	82%
6–9	John H. Linton Middle School	Pittsburgh	PA	3/27/96	35	41	47	50	47	52	52	52	44	48	47%
K–5	Penn Hebron Elementary School	Pittsburgh	PA	3/27/96	53	49	52	58	74	67	67	67	59	58	33%
10–12	Penn Hills Senior High School	Pittsburgh	PA	3/27/96	35		49		50		50		44		
K–5	Shenandoah Elementary School	Verona	PA	3/27/96	53	50	51	55	78	73	67	66	59	58	63%
K–5	Washington Elementary School	Pittsburgh	PA	3/27/96	53	51	52	53	81	83	68	73	60	61	60%
K–5	William Penn Elementary School	Verona	PA	3/27/96	53	47	51	53	77	80	69	69	59	58	45%
K–5	Wyland Elementary School	Allison Park	PA	12/1/96	58		57		80		69		63		
K–5	Central Elementary School	Allison Park	PA	5/15/98	59		59		90		71		66		
K–5	Poff Elementary School	Gibsonia	PA	5/15/98	60		59		88		74		67		
6–8	Hampton Middle School	Allison Park	PA		38		55		75		61		54		
9–12	Hampton High School	Allison Park	PA		40		50		70		54		50		
K–5	Blairsville Elementary School	Blairsville	PA	8/20/98	47		51		83		64		57		

40 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

Continued

SCHOOL TYPE	SCHOOL	CITY	STATE	IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHOP	Parental Involvement Index 1	Parental Involvement Index 2	Curriculum of the Home Index 1	Curriculum of the Home Index 2	Teacher Perceptions Index 1	Teacher Perceptions Index 2	Parent Perceptions Index 1	Parent Perceptions Index 2	SCHOOL COMMUNITY	SCHOOL COMMUNITY	DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION (DECEMBER)
K–6	Saltsburg Elementary School	Saltsburg	PA	8/20/98	45		54		71		60		55		
7–12	Saltsburg Junior/Senior High School	Saltsburg	PA	8/20/98	36		43		56		46		43		
6–8	Blairsville Middle School	Blairsville	PA	8/20/98	38		47		64		60		49		
9–12	Blairsville High School	Blairsville	PA	8/20/98	31		42		58		46		42		
K–5	Waters Landing Elementary School	Germantown	MD	10/12/96	61		62		71		71		65		
K–6	Pennypacker Park Elem. School	Willingboro	NJ	10/20/96	40		55		66		69		54		
7–8	Memorial Junior High School	Willingboro	NJ	10/20/96	33		43		53		52		43		
	Garfield East Elementary School	Willingboro	NJ	10/20/96											
	Twin Hills Elem. School	Willingboro	NJ	10/20/96											

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Additional Data

SCHOOL TYPE	SCHOOL	STATE	Attendance (%)	Poverty (%)	Enrollment	Number of Faculty	Reading 1995–96	Math 1995–96	Reading 1997–98	Math 1997–98	SCI 1: # of Parent Surveys	SCI 1: # of Teacher Surveys	SCI 1: % of Students Included in Parent Surveys	SCI 1: % of Teachers Included in Surveys	SCI 2: # of Parent Surveys	SCI 2: # of Teacher Surveys	SCI 2: % of Students Included in Parent Surveys	SCI 2: % of Teachers Included in Surveys
K–5	Bedford Elementary School	PA		43.4	880	62			1320	1350	407	36	55%	58%				
6–8	Bedford Middle School	PA		34.2	450	31			1270	1260	324	28	80%	90%				
K–5	Hyndman/Londonderry Elem.	PA		47.3	212	17			1300	1410	89	17	46%	100				
9–12	Bedford Senior High School	PA		26.0	622	42			1290	1250	93	26	17%	62%				
6–12	Hyndman Junior/Senior High	PA		39.6	241	21			1300	1190	57	8	27%	38%				
K–5	Dible Elementary School	PA	94.2	37.3	505	29	1270	1280	1340	1290	114	18	29%	62%	83	24	20%	63%
K–5	Forbes Elementary School	PA	94.7	42.6	410	23	1270	1300	1350	1400	126	22	47%	96%	115	28	38%	100
6–9	John H. Linton Middle School	PA	92.4	31.1	1,891	134	1200	1260	1310	1330	289	50	19%	37%	218	132	13%	94%
K–5	Penn Hebron Elementary School	PA	96.6	43.0	706	39	1280	1280	1300	1320	161	28	26%	72%	192	38	34%	81%
10–12	Penn Hills Senior High School	PA	88.4	20.5	1,363	85			1280	1290	245	85	20%	100	00	00		
K–5	Shenandoah Elementary School	PA	95.3	30.1	315	19	1300	1310	1360	1350	73	17	31%	89%	149	21	59%	88%
K–5	Washington Elementary School	PA	95.2	33.7	381	20	1270	1270	1320	1330	133	20	53%	100	81	34	28%	100
K–5	William Penn Elementary School	PA	95.4	35.5	266	14	1230	1250	1310	1290	49	13	25%	93%	131	15	59%	100
K–5	Wyland Elementary School	PA	96.5	12.9	413	31	1400	1480	1420	1390	159	29	58%	94%				
K–5	Central Elementary School	PA	96.7	6.0	506	40	1430	1410	1460	1410	169	40	36%	100				
K–5	Poff Elementary School	PA	96.8	5.4	554	26	1410	1380	1400	1370	127	26	43%	100				
6–8	Hampton Middle School	PA	96.0	6.8	741	55	1440	1440	1400	1430	153	48	23%	87%				
9–12	Hampton High School	PA	94.8	6.7	906	59			1380	1450	137	50	18%	85%				

42 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Continued

SCHOOL TYPE	SCHOOL	STATE	Attendance (%)	Poverty (%)	Enrollment	Number of Faculty	Reading 1995–96	Math 1995–96	Reading 1997–98	Math 1997–98	SCI 1: # of Parent Surveys	SCI 1: # of Teacher Surveys	SCI 1: % of Students Included in Parent Surveys	SCI 1: % of Teachers Included in Surveys	SCI 2: # of Parent Surveys	SCI 2: # of Teacher Surveys	SCI 2: % of Students Included in Parent Surveys	SCI 2: % of Teachers Included in Surveys
K–5	Blairsville Elementary School	PA		49.9	600	36			1290	1320	292	36	67%	100				
K–6	Saltsburg Elementary School	PA		39.3	600	40			1290	1320	288	36	68%	90%				
7–12	Saltsburg Junior/Senior High School	PA		42.5	445	34			1290	1190	68	31	21%	91%				
6–8	Blairsville Middle School	PA		47.9	350	20			1370	1340	70	17	24%	85%				
9–12	Blairsville High School	PA		34.0	415	30			1350	1350	38	24	13%	80%				
K–5	Waters Landing Elementary School	MD			376	39					296	25	55%	64%				
K–6	Pennypacker Park Elem. School	NJ			554	35					229	24	65%	69%				
7–8	Memorial Junior High School	NJ			981	90					120	54	13%	60%				
	TOTALS										4,307	809			969	292		

Table 3

Research Questions 1 and 2: Parental Involvement and Attendance, Poverty, Reading, and Math (9 K–5 Schools)

Indicator of Parental Involvement (from surveys)	Attendance	Poverty	Reading	Math
Percentage of parents who reported				
attending a parent–teacher conference in past year.	.400	-.629*	.686*	.629*
attending open house in past year.	.400	-.915**	.629*	.514
serving as classroom volunteer in past year.	.556*	-.167	.444	.444
Mean of Parent Involvement Items	*.648**	*-.310*	*.592**	*.592**

Note. Correlation coefficients; *correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed); **correlation is significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4

Research Questions 1 and 2: Curriculum of the Home and Attendance, Poverty, Reading, and Math (9 K–5 Schools)

Indicator of the Curriculum of the Home (from surveys)	Attendance	Poverty	Reading	Math
Percentage of parents who reported				
talking with child about child's reading on 3 or more days in past week.	.500	-.556*	.611*	.611*
child studied at home on 4 or more days in past week.	.444	-.389	.556*	.667*
child met grade-level threshold for study time per day.	.389	-.444	.500	.611*
child read at home for pleasure on 5 or more days in past week.	.366	-.310	.479	.592*
visiting museum, zoo, planetarium, etc. with child in past 6 months.	.457	-.286	.400	.400
talking with child about child's schoolwork on 5 or more days in past week.	.592*	-.310	.366	.423
Mean of Curriculum-of-the-Home Items	*.500*	*-.444*	*.833***	*.833***

Note. Correlation coefficients; *correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed); **correlation is significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5

Research Questions 1 and 2: Parents' Perceptions of the School Community and Attendance, Poverty, Reading, and Math (9 K–5 Schools)

Indicator of Parents' Perceptions of the School Community (from survey)	Attendance	Poverty	Reading	Math
Percentage of parents agreeing that				
the school library or learning center is well stocked with books for students.	.444	-.500	.778*	.778*
the school building is kept clean.	-.056	-.444	.611*	.611*
most teachers are models of respectful and responsible behavior.	.611*	-.444	.611*	.611*
the school library or learning center is a place children like to spend time.	.444	-.056	.556*	.667*
teachers assign homework routinely.	.500	-.444	.500	.500
students in the school receive a solid grounding in the basic skills.	.611*	-.667*	.500	.500
the school is safe and orderly.	.389	-.444	.500	.389
students generally treat teachers with respect.	.278	-.667*	.500	.389
most parents are models of respectful and responsible behavior.	.389	-.667*	.500	.389
the school building is in good repair and is well maintained.	-.056	-.222	.500	.389
students are proud to be at the school.	.389	-.556*	.500	.389
homework practices are fairly consistent from teacher to teacher.	.444	-.722*	.444	.444
teachers enjoy teaching at this school.	.500	-.111	.389	.500
Mean of Parents' Perceptions Items	*.389*	*-.444*	*.722**	*.722**

Note. Correlation coefficients; *Correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 6

Research Questions 1 and 2: Teachers' Perceptions of the School Community and Attendance, Poverty, Reading, and Math (9 K–5 Schools)

Indicator of Teachers' Perceptions of the School Community (from survey)	Attendance	Poverty	Reading	Math
Percentage of teachers agreeing that				
teachers assign homework routinely.				
students are taught how to study.	.556*	-.500	.778*	.778*
teachers let parents know good things their children have done.	.423	-.366	.648*	.648*
the school library or learning center is well stocked with books for students.	.366	-.366	.648*	.592*
most teachers know their students' parents.	.611*	-.444	.611*	.611*
parents let teachers know when their children have benefited from their teaching.	.500	-.667*	.611*	.611*
teachers talk with parents on the telephone.	.222	-.278	.556*	.444
most parents know their children's teachers.	.592*	-.592*	.535*	.535*
the school has a homework policy.	.611*	-.667*	.500	.611*
teachers send notes to parents.	.611*	-.444	.500	.611*
all students are helped to learn as much as they can.	.500	-.556*	.500	.500
parents encourage their children to read for pleasure.	.389	-.556*	.500	.500
the school library or learning center is a place children like to spend time.	.278	-.778**	.500	.389
reading is very important at the school.	.500	-.333	.500	.500
students get a solid grounding in the basic skills.	.278	-.444	.500	.500
if a parent has a concern about a child, the teachers will listen and help.	.389	-.556*	.500	.500
homework practices are fairly consistent from teacher to teacher.	.366	-.535*	.479	.479
homework is very important at the school.	.778*	-.500	.444	.444
most teachers are models of respectful and responsible behavior.	.556*	-.278	.444	.444
students have the opportunity to learn more about topics of interest to them.	.333	-.722**	.444	.333
the school building is in good repair and is well maintained.	.333	-.611*	.444	.333
	.085	-.479	.423	.310
Mean of Teachers' Perceptions Items	*.444*	*-.500*	*.667**	.667*

Note. Correlation coefficients; *Correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

47 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7

Research Question 3: Degree of Implementation, SCC Meetings, and Changes in School Community Indices (6 Schools)

Figures indicate Pearson Correlation/ Kendall's tau-b	Degree of Implementation	Number of SCC Meetings	Change in School Community Index	Change in Parental Involvement Index	Change in Curriculum-of-the-Home Index	Change in Teachers' Perceptions Index	Change in Parents' Perceptions Index
Degree of Implementation		.790/.600	.197/.149	.206/.200	-.394/.200	.388/.414	-.146/-.298
Number of SCC Meetings	.790/.600		.696/.411	.721/.524	.011/-.048	.523/.293	-.089/.000
Change in School Community Index	.197/.149	.696/.411		.923**/.926**	.100/.000	.703/.580	.337/.222
Change in Parental Involvement Index	.206/.200	.721/.524	.923**/.926**		.040/.048	.531/.488	.071/.103
Change in Curriculum of the Home Index	-.394/-.200	-.501/-.048	.100/.000	.040/.048		-.438/-.195	-.074/.000
Change in Teachers' Perceptions Index	.388/.414	.523/.293	.703/.580	.531/.488	.438/.195		.316/.158
Change in Parents' Perceptions Index	-.146/-.298	-.089/.000	.337/.222	.071/.103	.074/.000	.316/.158	

Note. Correlation coefficients; *correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed); **correlation is significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8

Research Question 4: Degree of Implementation, SCC Meetings, and Changes in Student Learning Outcomes (6 Schools)

Figures indicate Pearson Correlation/ Kendall's tau-b	Degree of Implementation	Number of SCC Meetings	Change in Reading Assessment	Change in Math Assessment
Degree of Implementation		.790/.600	.309/.276	.805/.690
Number of SCC Meetings	.790/.600		.812*/.390	.760*/.551
Change in Reading Assessment	.309/.276	.637/.390		.379/.308
Change in Math Assessment	.805/.690	.760*/.551	.379/.308	

Note. Correlation coefficients; *correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed); **correlation is significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 9

Research Question 5 : Changes in SCC Indices and Changes in Student Learning Outcomes (7 Schools)

Figures indicate Pearson Correlation/ Kendall's tau-b	Change in Reading Assessment	Change in Math Assessment	Change in School Community Index	Change in Parental Involvement Index	Change in Curriculum-of-the-Home Index	Change in Teachers' Perceptions Index	Change in Parents' Perceptions Index
Change in Reading Assessment		.379/N/A	.197/.149	.206/.200	-.394/-.200	.388/.414	-.146/-.298
Change in Math Assessment	.379/.308		.696/.411	.721/.524	.011/-.048	.523/.293	-.089/.000
Change in School Community Index	.812*/.738*	.397/.379		.923**/.926**	.100/.000	.703/.580	.337/.222
Change in Parental Involvement Index	.818*/.683*	.361/.250	.923**/.926**		.040/.048	.531/.488	.071/.103
Change in Curriculum-of-the-Home Index	-.111/.098	-.501/-.350	.100/.000	.040/.048		-.438/-.195	-.074/.000
Change in Teachers' Perceptions Index	.746/.650*	.681/.718*	.703/.580	.531/.488	-.438/-.195		.316/.158
Change in Parents' Perceptions Index	-.052/-.053	.004/.108	.337/.222	.071/.103	-.074/.000	.316/.158	

Note. Correlation coefficients; *correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed); **correlation is significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 10

Changes in Survey of Parents: Seven Alliance for Achievement Schools

	1996	1998
Percentage of parents who reported that	%	%
they attended two or more PTO/PTA meetings in the past year.	33.8	41.7
their child studied at home on 4 or more days in the past week.	48.2	62.2
their child spent 31 minutes or more reading at home on a typical day in the past week.	33.7	45.0
they talked with their child about their child's school experience on 5 or more days in the past week.	68.8	76.8
they talked with their child about something the child was reading on 3 or more days in the past week.	51.2	59.2
their child watched TV on 5 or fewer days in the past week.	36.7	56.0

REFERENCES

Baker, P. J. (1991). Metaphors of mindful engagement and a vision of better schools. *Educational Leadership, 48*(7), 32–35.

Baker, P. J., &. Moss, R. K. (1993). Creating a community of readers. *School Community Journal, 3*(1), 23–36.

Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Blankenhorn, D. (1995). *Fatherless America*. New York: Basic Books.

Burke, E. (1960). *Reflections on the revolution in France*. London: J. M. Dent. (Original work published 1790)

Cibulka, J, O'Brien T., & Zewe, D. (1982). *Inner-city private elementary schools: A study*. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press.

Cobb, C. W. (1992). *Responsive schools, renewed communities*. San Francisco: ICS Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1987). Families and schools. *Educational Researcher 16*(6), 32–38.

Coleman, J. S. (1990). *The foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Coleman, J. S., & Hoffer, T. (1987). *Public and private high schools: The impact of communities*. New York: Basic Books.

Coleman, J. S., & Husén, T. (1987). *Becoming adult in a changing society*. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.

Dave, R. H. (1963). *The identification and measurement of environmental process variables that are related to educational achievement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Epstein, J. (1987). Parent involvement: What research says to administrators. *Education and Urban Society 19*(2), 119–136.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Etzioni, A. (1991). *A responsive society.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Etzioni, A. (1993). *The spirit of community.* New York: Crown.

Kellaghan, T., Sloane, K., Alvarez, B., & Bloom, B. (1993). *The home environment and school learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lasch, C. (1991). *The true and only heaven.* New York: Norton.

Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character.* New York: Bantam Books.

Mack, D. (1997). *The assault on parenthood.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6*(1), 65–78.

Redding, S. (1990). *Alliance for achievement: Building the value-based school community.* Lincoln, IL: ADI Press.

Redding, S. (1996). Quantifying the components of school community. *School Community Journal, 6*(2), 131–147.

Riesman, D. (with Glazer, N., & Denney, R.). (1961). *The lonely crowd.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). *Building community in schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). The politics of virtue: A new compact for leadership in schools. *School Community Journal, 5*(2), 13–22.

Tocqueville, A. de. (1955). *The old regime and the French revolution.* (Stuart Gilbert, Trans.). Garden City, NY: Doubleday. (Original work published 1856)

Walberg, H. J. (1984). Families as partners in educational productivity. *Phi Delta Kappan, 65,* 397–400.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research, 63*(3), 249–294.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1997). Fostering resilience: What do we know? *Principal, 77*(2), 18–20.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Weissberg, R. (1991). Promoting competent young people in competence-enhancing environments: A systems-based perspective on primary prevention. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*(6), 830–41.

Weissberg, R. (1997). Creating a districtwide social development project. *Educational Leadership, 54*(8), 37–39.

Yap, K. O., & Enoki, D. Y. (1995). In search of the elusive magic bullet: Parental involvement and student outcomes. *School Community Journal, 5*(2), 97–105.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
X	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").